

August 11, 2004  
Case No.: DP-304537 (7500/101)  
Serial No.: 10/040,521  
Filed: January 7, 2002  
Page 10 of 14

**-- REMARKS --**

Claims 2-25 remain under consideration. Claims 3 and 5-17 are allowed.

**A. Claims 1, 2, 4, 18, 19 and 21-25 were rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Heintzmann.**

In order to maintain this §102(e) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 18, 19 and 21-25, each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in at least as great detail as claimed. The rejection is traversed, as the reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

The rejection of claim 1 is obviated by cancellation. Claim 1 has been cancelled, not to avoid any reference but to expedite prosecution, and Applicants reserve the right to present claim 1 in continuation applications. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 is requested.

The Examiner failed to specifically reject any of the remaining claims, and therefore, each claim should be allowable. In an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants will address each claim

Heintzmann does not disclose, as claimed in claim 2, "the jaw-tooth clutch means including a rotating jaw operatively attached to the shaft for rotation about the axis, and a translating jaw operatively connected to the housing for non-rotatable translation along the axis and into engagement with the rotating jaw, the rotating and translating jaws each having axially directed mating teeth affixed on mating surfaces of the jaws, the jaw-tooth clutch thereby locking the shaft against rotation about the axis." At most, Heintzmann discloses that a "conventional clutch 7 can be provided, e.g. in the form of a jaw clutch or a friction clutch." See, Heintzmann column 4, lines 13-15. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 2 is requested.

August 11, 2004  
Case No.: DP-304537 (7500/101)  
Serial No.: 10/040,521  
Filed: January 7, 2002  
Page 11 of 14

Heintzmann does not disclose, as claimed in claim 4, "the jaw-tooth clutch means including a rotating jaw operatively attached to the shaft for rotation about the axis, and a translating jaw operatively connected to the housing for non-rotatable translation along the axis and into engagement with the rotating jaw, the rotating and translating jaws each having axially directed mating teeth affixed on mating surfaces of the jaws, the jaw-tooth clutch thereby locking the shaft against rotation about the axis; and means for moving the translating jaw along the axis for selectively engaging and disengaging the mating teeth of the jaws of the jaw-tooth clutch.." At most, Heintzmann discloses that a "conventional clutch 7 can be provided, e.g. in the form of a jaw clutch or a friction clutch." See, Heintzmann column 4, lines 13-15.

Notably, claim 4 invokes 35 U.S.C. §112 paragraph 6 by using "means for" language. See, e.g. MPEP Section 2181. Therefore, Applicants are entitled to the broadest reasonable interpretation, in light of and consistent with the written description of the invention in the application. See, *In re Donaldson Co.*, 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994). As Heintzmann does not disclose the element, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 4 is requested.

Heintzmann does not disclose, as claimed in claim 18, "a clutch actuation motor adapted for receiving power from a second power source independent from the first power source, and operatively connected to the jaw tooth clutch means for driving the jaw-tooth clutch means for selectively locking the shaft against rotation about the axis." At most, Heintzmann discloses that a "conventional clutch 7 can be provided, e.g. in the form of a jaw clutch or a friction clutch." See, Heintzmann column 4, lines 13-15. Therefore, Heintzmann cannot disclose each and every element of claim 18, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 19 depends from claim 18, and is therefore allowable over Heintzmann for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 19 is requested.

August 11, 2004  
Case No.: DP-304537 (7500/101)  
Serial No.: 10/040,521  
Filed: January 7, 2002  
Page 12 of 14

Heintzmann does not disclose, as claimed in claim 21, "operatively connecting a translating jaw of the jaw-tooth clutch to the housing for non-rotatable translation along the axis and into engagement with the rotating jaw, the rotating and translating jaws each having axially directed mating teeth affixed on mating surfaces of the jaws." Therefore, Heintzmann cannot disclose each and every element of claim 21, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Heintzmann does not disclose, as claimed in claim 22, "moving the translating jaw out of engagement with the rotating jaw for unlocking the shaft and allowing rotation of the shaft about the axis." Furthermore, claim 22 depends from claim 21 and is allowable over the reference for at least the same reasons as claim 21. Therefore, Heintzmann cannot disclose each and every element of claim 22, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Heintzmann does not disclose, at least, as claimed in claim 23, "moving the translating jaw with a second drive motor having a power source independent from the first power source." Therefore, Heintzmann cannot disclose each and every element of claim 23, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Heintzmann does not disclose at least, as claimed in claim 24, "rotating the shaft of the drive motor for engaging the brake apparatus by applying power from the first power source to the drive motor; moving the translating jaw into engagement with the rotating jaw for, locking the shaft against rotation about the axis; and rotating the shaft of the drive motor through an additional angular distance after moving the translating jaw into engagement with the rotating jaw, to thereby ensure locking engagement of the rotating and translating jaws." Therefore, Heintzmann cannot disclose each and every element of claim 24, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

August 11, 2004  
Case No.: DP-304537 (7500/101)  
Serial No.: 10/040,521  
Filed: January 7, 2002  
Page 13 of 14

Claim 25 has been amended to correct erroneous claim dependency, and not to claim around any reference Heintzmann does not disclose at least, as claimed in claim 25, "removing power from the drive motor after moving the translating jaw into engagement with the rotating jaw of the jaw-tooth clutch." Furthermore, claim 25 depends from claim 24 and is therefore allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 24. Therefore, Heintzmann cannot disclose each and every element of claim 25, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**B. Claim 20 was objected to as depending on a rejected base claim**

The objection to claim 20 is traversed. Claim 20 depends directly from claim 19 and indirectly from claim 18, and is therefore allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claims 18 and 19. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 20 is requested.

August 11, 2004  
Case No.: DP-304537 (7500/101)  
Serial No.: 10/040,521  
Filed: January 7, 2002  
Page 14 of 14

**SUMMARY**

Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and notification of allowance are respectfully requested.

Dated: August 11, 2004

Respectfully submitted,  
DAVID B. DRENNEN, *et al.*

DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES INC.  
Legal Staff  
P.O. Box 5052  
Mail Code: 480-410-202  
Troy, Michigan 48007-5052  
(248) 813-1250

---

Michael D. Smith  
Registration No. 40,181  
Attorney for Applicants

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

---



Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicants